

STATEMENT BY [REDACTED]

This statement is being sent by fax on 15 January 2001 to Thomas McCarthy of the National Labor Relations Board, Region 5, Washington Resident Office, 1099 14th Street NW, Room 5530, Washington, DC 20570.

*Exempting
b27(c)*

On 29 August 2000, I received a phone call from [REDACTED] at Physics Today magazine. [REDACTED] and I are [REDACTED] having worked together for several years at Physics Today. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] is in the habit of giving me periodic updates about the magazine. This phone call concerned an emergency meeting convened earlier that day by [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED] told the assembled [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had "harassed" someone who had applied for an editorial job at Physics Today. The applicant had then complained to someone at AIP, the staff was told. As best I can recall, [REDACTED] then said, according to [REDACTED] that information about job searches is confidential and should not be shared with people outside the magazine, and that performance reviews also should not be discussed with others. [REDACTED] was extremely upset when we talked, as [REDACTED] felt [REDACTED] remarks had been aimed at [REDACTED] being that [REDACTED] is still on friendly terms with [REDACTED] feared that [REDACTED] would find some way to [REDACTED]

At the time, my reaction had been to dismiss the possibility of retaliation. I knew that [REDACTED] was monitoring the company's hiring practices, and that it was highly unlikely that [REDACTED] had harassed the applicant. It seemed far more likely that the applicant had simply mentioned to someone at AIP that [REDACTED] had been contacted by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] grew concerned about speaking with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] were exaggerating the situation to turn staff sentiment against [REDACTED].

Although I still think that is what happened, I was wrong to believe that [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] connection to [REDACTED]. In the months since the August meeting, [REDACTED] has subjected [REDACTED] work to closer and more critical scrutiny, to the point where [REDACTED] recently confronted [REDACTED] about it. [REDACTED] told me that [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] more carefully these days. When [REDACTED] asked why, [REDACTED] said, "Because I have the time." When [REDACTED] complained that [REDACTED] remarks were often off-putting, [REDACTED] replied, "I don't have the time to be diplomatic."

As an aside, I must say that the changes [REDACTED] insists [REDACTED] make to [REDACTED] news stories often do nothing to improve them and in many cases actually make them worse. [REDACTED] occasionally seeks my advice when [REDACTED] has received such a directive from [REDACTED] to see

[REDACTED] if I can think of some way that [REDACTED] can appease [REDACTED] without damaging [REDACTED] work. Many of [REDACTED] comments seem almost designed to irritate.

[REDACTED] also recently told me that [REDACTED] has been discussing with [REDACTED] the possibility of [REDACTED] taking over the "Physics Community" section of the magazine. Until now, [REDACTED] have been [REDACTED] for producing the section. If [REDACTED] does take over the section, it effectively will be a [REDACTED] who not only is an experienced and capable journalist but [REDACTED]

On 10 January 2001, I called [REDACTED] to confirm that my recollection of our phone conversation in August was the same as [REDACTED] agreed with my description of the conversation, except that [REDACTED] could not remember whether or not [REDACTED] had mentioned performance reviews.

[REDACTED]